

### REMARKS

Applicant canceled all remaining claims except claims 15 and 25, which are currently pending in this application, after the Office stated in the prior Action that these claims contained allowable subject matter. The Office has now rejected claim 15 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sunahara (U.S. Pat. 6,153,290). Claim 25 also has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sunahara in view Chakravorty (U.S. Pat. 6,611,419). This is a non-final Office action and is responsive to Applicant's communication filed on or before August 15, 2005.

#### Claim 15 Rejection under 102(b)

Regarding claim 15, Applicant would like to respectfully point out that Sunahara fails to teach or suggest "a discrete resistor having first and second electrodes," as required by Applicant. In the Office action mailed November 10, 2005, the Office states that element 12 of Fig. 1 satisfies this requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Sunahara teaches in col. 7, lines 8-18 that element 12 of Fig. 1 is a thick-film resistor that is created by screening a resistive paste onto a ceramic green sheet. Sunahara further teaches creating conductive wires by screening conductive paste onto the ceramic green sheet so that the conductive paste contacts the resistive paste. A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a thick-film resistor is not the same as a discrete resistor. Additionally, the skilled person would understand that thick-film resistors do not have electrodes as required by Applicant. At least these elements are missing from Sunahara. Therefore, the rejection is improper and the claim is allowable over this reference.

#### Claim 25 Rejection under 103(a)

Regarding claim 25, Applicant would like to respectfully point out that neither Sunahara or Chakravorty teach or suggest "a discrete resistor having first and second electrodes," as required by Applicant. The Office relies on Sunahara for this element and as shown above, this element is missing from Sunahara. The element is also missing from Chakravorty which never uses the term resistor. A prima facie case of obviousness has therefore not been established because the combination of the references does not

show or suggest all the elements of the claim. The rejection is therefore improper and the claim is allowable over these references.

CONCLUSION

Applicant asks that the Office reconsider this application and allow all pending claims. Please charge any fees that might be due, excluding the issue fee, to deposit account 14-0225.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb. 13, 2006



Harden E. Stevens, III  
Reg. No. 55,649

NCR Corporation  
1700 South Patterson Blvd.  
Dayton, Ohio 45479

(803) 939-6505  
(803) 939-5521 (fax)